DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 010 CG 006 067

AUTHOR	Weber, J. Robert; Custer, Carson
TITLE	Youth Involvement
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. ($.25 per copy)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents, Community Development, *Decision Making, *Delinquency, Program Design, Social Change, *Youth, Youth Problems, *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This booklet provides an introduction to the concept of youth involvement and is intended to provide information for those working in the delinquency fields. Traditionally youth involvement has been concerned with making programs more meaningful to youth and in fostering commitment on the part of youth to the goals of a program. This publication, however, is concerned with youth involvement defined as the active participation of young people in decision making regarding programs and policies that affect them and in implementing these programs and policies. After a discussion of the societal context for the participation of youth, the history of youth involvement, and various youth involvement models employed in the past it is concluded that with the exception of the development of techniques for involving delinquents in helping other delinquents very little has been learned about involving youth in decision making and program implementation. Recently, however, there has been a shift from treating youth as mere recipients of services to engaging them as active participants. Examples of such programs are presented. (RSM)

ED046010

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CS 006 067

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration
Washington, D.C. 20201

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

J. Robert Weber

Carson Custer

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Youth Development and Delinquency
Prevention Administration
1970

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 25 cents

FOREWORD

Today's youth are calling for change on a variety of issues, and clearly wish to become more directly "involved" in matters that concern them. Very often, it is the idealism of youth with its fresh perspective that can point to the need for change. It is that idealism, meshed with realistic controls of adult society, which can and will accomplish peaceful and constructive change.

The concept of youth involvement is one which is often used by those working in the field of delinquency prevention and youth development. But what *is* youth involvement? Actually *any* program concerned with youth, "involves" youth. However, what we are concerned with, in this publication, is youth involvement defined as the *active* participation of young people in decision-making regarding programs and policies that affect them, and an equally *active* role in implementing these programs and policies.

This booklet is not intended to be a definite treatment of the subject. Rather, it should serve as a useful introduction to the concept, presenting a short history of youth involvement and several models.

It was prepared for this Office under a grant to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Its authors are J. Robert Weber and Carson Custer of the NCCD Staff.

Publication of this booklet is intended to provide information to those working in the delinquency fields, and ***does not constitute official endorsement of any views expressed.***

ROBERT J. GEMIGNANI
Commissioner
Youth Development and Delinquency
Prevention Administration

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A curious feature of the literature on youth involvement is that most of it is an exhortation to involve youth, and very little deals with description of actual practice or an evaluation of the effectiveness of youth involvement in relation to goal achievement. It is almost as if youth ought to participate because it would be "good" for them. Sometimes it is implied that youth involvement would be "good" for adults. At other times youth involvement sounds like a strategy to shift decision-making power in such a manner that would enhance the writer's viewpoint.

The goal of youth involvement most often stated in the literature is that of making programs more "meaningful" to youth. The word "meaningful," however, is never clearly defined. In some cases it appears to connote commitment on the part of youth to the goals of a program. "Youth involvement" is either a technique to motivate youth or to neutralize their opposition to program goals. It is a method, a means, a strategy to achieve a goal.

The extent to which youth perceive their participation in decision-making as a means of manipulation, if they do at all, and the extent to which this factor may have contributed to the failure of some youth involvement programs, is unknown, but it is probably not insignificant.

Youth view their participation at times as co-optation, yet precisely what this means to youth is never clearly defined. Some youngsters have articulated that co-optation occurs any time their viewpoint does not prevail and they have to settle for some compromise. In a formal sense, co-optation means "a process by which new elements are absorbed into the leadership of an organization as a means of averting outside threats."[1] It may be that youth perceive the danger of co-optation, although many times this seems to be what youth are requesting.

If youth involvement is a strategy, then what is the ultimate goal? Shmelzer suggests that this question requires clarification of what is meant by youth development in current society.

> **We realize that a discussion of techniques without specific reference to the ends to which these techniques should be employed may limit the impact of that discussion. On the other hand, it is quite clear that a consideration of youth involvement as it**

[1] Blau, Peter M. and Scott, W. Richard. *Formal organizations, a comparative approach*. San Francisco, Chandler Publishing, 962. pp. 196-197.

> **might refer to the ideal conditions under which youth in this society should live, the political process, or national policy furnishes the basis for quite a different type of discussion—specifically, consideration of that whole area we call youth development.[1]**

Whether youth involvement should be a goal or a strategy is unresolved, but the bulk of the literature deals with youth involvement as a means to achieve some stated program goal. With the exception of a body of literature by some social critics (such as Paul Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*) there is no further discussion of youth involvement as an end in itself or what youth development should be.

In the political arena where national policy is directly influenced, youth endeavor to have their ideas heard. At present, some of the issues are marihuana, the draft, Vietnam, poverty, and university curriculum and structures. In these areas, when youth or their representatives speak, youth participation is an end or goal in itself. When adults speak, or those representing "establishment" views, youth involvement becomes a method to reduce conflict and to allow youth a chance to be heard in a controlled situation. Youth may learn to understand why things are as they are and the values undergirding the status quo. Adults may find, however, that the values, beliefs, and morals that youth hold in opposition to the "establishment" are not susceptible to change through youth involvement techniques. In fact, these values and beliefs may prevail by changing adult behavior through adult participation with youth.

It becomes clear that youth involvement is an issue only when a group called "youth" is isolated from full citizen participation. If a child reaches a point that differentiates childhood from maturity, and this point in time involves a clear break from dependence to full participation in community decision-making, then youth involvement as an idea is not only irrelevant, it is meaningless.

In 1947, a national conference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice concluded:

> **(1) That if children and young people are to become the self-reliant, self-disciplined, and thinking adults so essential to the success of a democratic society, these children and young people must be recognized as increasingly capable of managing their own affairs and of sharing responsibility for the affairs of the community.**
>
> **(2) That opportunity must be provided for a genuine partnership between young people and adults in community planning for the welfare and growth of these young people.**
>
> **These two principles must be applied to all phases of community**

[1] Shmelzer, June. "Youth involvement: a position paper." Washington, D.C., Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1966. p. 27.

life. In the family, the church, the school, and the community the child must be treated as a responsible person and accorded the dignity that is his right as an individual.[3]

In a paper prepared for the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, youth involvement was defined as:

"Generically, 'youth involvement' refers to varying sets of procedures that can be employed to enable youth to participate directly in the activities, programs, services, etc., that are designed to affect them. In the youth involvement type of project, youth are not only recipients of services, not exclusively the objects of action, but key figures in developing and/or dispensing services—therefore also subjects of action. This may be stated in another way: if a youth development or delinquency project has some kind of change as its ultimate objective, then it is the youth target group of the project who are at once both the objects and agents of change." [4]

The first quotation emphasizes youth involvement as an essential ingredient in maturation. The second is more concerned with change processes—both personal and social.

For the purposes of this review, Youth Involvement is defined simply as the participation of youth (teens and early twenties) in decision-making regarding policies and programs that have direct or indirect impact upon themselves. Obviously this includes participation from the target population of youth, e.g., poverty groups, offender groups, students, or ghetto youngsters, depending upon the program mission.

[3] *Recommendations for action.* Prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice by the panels of the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947. p. 81.
[4] *Op. cit. supra* note 2, p. 1.

THE SOCIETAL CONTEXT FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF YOUTH

The idea of increasing opportunities for youth to participate in the decision making processes of programs affecting youth, at first impression, would seem to be quite old, yet the literature reveals that the concept of youth involvement, on the contrary, is relatively recent.

The participation of youth in politics certainly is not new and youth revolts with political objectives can be documented in European countries well back into the middle ages. The European student revolts of the 19th century were largely an attempt to secure greater political power, but no one thought to call this "youth involvement." The United States, however, was untouched by the European student youth rebellions of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The Democratic primary campaign of 1968 is an example of youth involvement in the political process. Youngsters wanted to have their voices heard regarding issues that directly affected them—Vietnam and the draft. Curiously, as yet there has been no definitive study of the value or the dangers of youth participation in the politics of 1968. An historical perspective of youth movements in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries reveals an ambivalent attitude toward the value of youth participation in politics.[5]

In earlier societies, and even into 20th century America, there was a clear demarcation between the status of childhood and adulthood. The period between childhood and adulthood, now called adolescence, the teen age, youth, etc., is a fairly recent development in human society. And youth has developed its own subculture quite distinct from childhood roles and statuses and nearly as distinct from roles and statuses of adulthood.

> **Years ago when schooling ended for the vast majority at 14 or 15 (and thereafter one became self-supporting, got married, had children) there was no need for adolescent revolt. Puberty is a biological fact, but adolescence as we know it, with its special identity crises, is not. All children grow up and become pubertal. They do not all become adolescents. To be adolescent means that**

[5] For example, see: Laquer, Walter. "Reflections on youth movements." *Commentary*, (June) 1969.

one has reached (and even passed) the age of puberty, is at the very height of one's physical development—healthier, stronger, even handsomer than one has been, or will be, for the rest of one's life—but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood till long beyond what any other period in history has ever considered reasonable.[6]

The development of a subculture of youth is a by-product of industrialization. A modern economy creates demands for new job skills prior to entry into the job market, so youngsters attend school for a longer period of time than ever before. Many youngsters maintain student status and are not ready to embark on their careers until well into their 20's. The role of "student" has been expanded to include larger segments of the population for longer periods of time than ever before. With greater automation in industry fewer non-skilled jobs are available. The labor market has vastly changed. The trend has been to shorter work weeks, earlier retirement, and delay in the readiness of employers to hire adolescents. The demand for longer periods of training in effect raises the minimum age for entry into the job market.[7]

Thus, adult roles of provider, mate, and parent have been postponed. A new status of physical maturity but social unreadiness for assimilation into adult roles creates a new stage in human development. This age interregnum between childhood and adulthood, called youth, is a very recent phenomenon in the societies of man. The technological development of the communications media in the past 40 years has created common values, attitudes, beliefs, and styles which give this subculture its identity and cohesion.[8] Thus, modern man in an industrial economy finds that at the peak of his physical powers he is prevented from participating in the processes that directly affect the quality, and sometimes even the existence, of his own life. The resulting alienation not only does not blind but on the contrary sharpens youth's perception of the inconsistencies, discontinuities, hypocrisy, and myths of the ruling generation.

[6] Bettelheim, Bruno. "Obsolete youth: towards a psychograph of adolescent rebellion." *Encounter*, (September): 1969, p. 32.
[7] For an informative review of youth culture in a modern economy, see *Daedalus*, (Winter): 1962.
[8] *Id.*, p. 160.

A HISTORY OF YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

The very earliest use of the concept of youth involvement was in the institutional care of children without parents and children with problems sufficient to cause the community to provide an institutional residence in an effort to ameliorate the problems.

In the late 19th century with the energy of William George, childcaring institutions were established in several parts of the United States based on the concept of youngsters assuming adult roles in an institution called a "republic." The purpose of the program was to produce good citizens, and the population under care assumed considerable responsibility for self-government, with youngsters having titles such as Mayor, Sheriff, Commissioner of Health and Welfare. This program, which began with considerable enthusiasm, evolved and broadened through the years, and many of the original concepts are no longer viable.[9]

Self-government by youth continued to be the only vehicle for the concept of youth involvement during the early decades of the 20th century. Recreation, character building, and youth serving organizations such as Boy Scouts, Boys Clubs, YMCA's, and church youth organizations devoted considerable time during the 1920's and 1930's to training adult leaders in "the patrol method," "parliamentary procedures," "self-governed youth interest clubs," and athletic leagues of voluntary and self-organized teams.[10] Despite this emphasis on training adult leaders to increase opportunities for youngsters to plan their own recreational programs and other activities deemed character building, in practice, programs were nearly always planned and operated by adults.

At the first White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1910, and at the second in 1920, there was no mention of the concept of youth involvement. In the White House conference of the 1930's one paper obliquely refers to a role youth might fill in the planning and implementation of a Boys Club program, but the idea was not developed beyond the confines of increasing opportunities for self-government. At the

[9] See: Martineau, Paul. "Junior Republic as a community." *Community Education*, (Autumn): 183-190, 1964; and Urquhart, Donald T. "Crime prevention through citizenship training at the George Junior Republic." *Community Education*, (Autumn): 305, 1964.

[10] See any of the training manuals of Boys Clubs, Boy Scouts, YMCA's during this period of time.

1940 White House Conference on Children and Youth, the concept again was touched upon in several papers and discussions but again primarily in the context of recreational and youth serving agencies in the community.

During the 40's, following World War II, the concept of youth involvement as a technique was fully developed, and at the 1950 White House conference the concept was mentioned frequently. Perhaps for the first time there were youth directly involved in the planning of the conference and as participants. At the White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1960, youth involvement as a concept had achieved the prominence of a central theme despite the fact the concept had played a lesser role in practice during the decade of the 50's than it had in the 40's. Youth, however, on a very broad base participated in the planning and as participants in the 1960 White House conference.[11]

According to the literature retrieved on the subject of youth involvement in delinquency prevention and control, the first major approach was the Chicago Area Project. This was a community organization program to reduce delinquency in a given geographic area which placed emphasis on participation of youth with adults in various organizations and programs. The idea was that youth involvement techniques aimed at increasing a community sense of responsibility for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency would indeed reduce delinquency.[12] The influence of the Area Project ideas and practices built slowly through the 30's, and reached their apex in the immediate post-war years of the 40's.

A conference, held in New York City in January 1945, resulted from the concern of many individuals and organizations with the problems of young people which had been aggravated by the impact of war. Youth were involved in the planning of the conference; there was a youth advisory committee composed of 18 adolescents; and 100 of the 600 participants in the conference were youths. The purposes of the conference were: (1) to give a representative group of young people and adult leaders in the community an opportunity to discuss with each other the problems confronting youth today, particularly in the area of health, jobs, recreation, education, and community participation; and (2) to make suggestions and recommendations which would form the basis of a unified community approach to these problems.[13] The main finding of the conference was the necessity for active participation of youth on all levels and at every stage. The conference was considered very successful, although attempts to trace the results of the conference in subsequent programming of the participating agencies were fruitless. Youth councils were organized in some youth-serving agencies but there are no available reports describing or evaluating the

[11] See proceedings and reports of the White House Conferences on Children and Youth, published by the Government Printing Office, 1910-1960.

[12] Shaw, Clifford, R. and Henry D. McKay. *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas.* Rev. ed. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1969.

[13] Conference on Youth Needs. Report of the proceedings sponsored by the Civilian Defense Volunteer Office and Welfare Council of New York City, January 13, 1945.

use of youth councils in New York City agencies in the late 40's. The concept of youth involvement in New York City does not again receive major emphasis in the literature until the mid-50's, when groundwork was laid for what subsequently was known as Mobilization for Youth. In the interim 10 years between the 1945 conference and the development of the Mobilization for Youth program, the major focus in New York City was in preventing gang conflicts through recreation, detached worker, and law enforcement programs.

Following the lead of New York City, several other cities and states held conferences on the subject of youth involvement during 1946 and 1947, but apparently very few went so far as to involve youth in the planning of these conferences or as participants. Generally, they were adult conferences in which adults talked about the need for youth participation. An excellent example is the Federal conference convened by the U.S. Department of Justice in 1947. Youth did not participate, although the overriding recommendation of the conference was for youth involvement.[14] This pattern of meetings and conferences of adults calling for youth involvement, with few exceptions *without involving youth,* persisted, rather remarkably, through the 50's.

[14] *Op. cit. supra* note 3.

THE "YOUTH COUNCIL" MODEL

A common recommendation of these adult conferences calling for youth involvement was the establishment of a "youth council". One of the better models and illustrations of the concept of youth councils was developed in Minnesota and published in 1949.[15] Models and bylaws of youth councils at local, regional, and state levels were outlined. The following represents the outline for organizing a local youth council and is typical of the youth council idea in other states and locales.

A youth council[16] usually consists of elected representatives from youth organizations. These representatives are chosen by the youth organization itself and not solely appointed by adults or selected by any outside group. Usually a successful youth council includes an Executive Board of Youth Members, chosen by the youth themselves, and paralleled by an Adult Advisory Committee, selected partly by the youth and partly by the adult advisors of the participating organizations.

It shall be the responsibility of the youth council to help point up the problems of youth and to properly interpret these problems to the Executive Board of the youth commission. The youth council shall share in the responsibility of implementing plans being developed for the welfare of youth.

Membership:

(1) Three representatives from each senior high school.
(2) Two representatives from each junior high school.
(3) One representative from each grade school.
(4) Three representatives from the 18-20 age group.
(5) One representative from each of the following: Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H, Rural Youth, Future Farmers, Future Homemakers, and all other youth organizations in the area including church organizations.

Officers:

(1) Officers of this council shall be the President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and Program Chairman.

[15] Minnesota. Youth Conservation Commission. Community Organization for Youth. A manual for community planning. St. Paul, Minn., 1949.
[16] *Id.*, p. 12, 13.

(2) Officers shall be elected by members of the council.
(3) Advisor of the council shall be a member of the youth commission Executive Board selected by the Board.

Duties:

(1) To meet at least monthly on call of the President of the council.
(2) To advise the Executive Board of the Adult Youth Commission of needs of youth and work with them in the formulation of plans for youth programs and the implementation of those plans.
(3) Self-surveys may be undertaken to determine unmet needs of youth.
(4) Develop youth service projects.

Council Relationship to Club or Organization:

(1) A council is not made up of many clubs or organizations but by *individual delegates* who represent youth clubs or organizations.
(2) The youth council delegate seeks to promote cooperation and understanding between council members as well as between youth clubs and organizations.
(3) The youth council delegate is responsible to his club for advancing his club's education and understanding concerning council discussion.
(4) The youth delegate is responsible to the youth council for fair interpretation of the views, policies, and desires of his club or organization.

Sample Projects for a Youth Council:

Council delegates should democratically decide what problems they wish to tackle. Problems may include:

(1) Problems of individual clubs or groups may be brought to the council for help or suggestion.
(2) Problems of recreation needs and opportunities.
(3) Problems of prejudice in the school or community.
(4) Problems of employment or part-time work.
(5) Special health problems or hazards.
(6) Vocational, counseling and testing needs in the school.
(7) How to plan a youth conference to learn and exchange ideas.
(8) Projects of community service: Red Feather activities, welfare projects, camping, recreation, and health.

Youth Councils never really flourished. Explanations have been lack of funds, lack of sustained adult leadership, and inability to maintain interest of youth. An attempt to locate literature describing the operation of youth councils or analyses of success or failure was unsuccessful. Certainly, not all were totally ineffectual. Following the White House conference of 1950 and again in 1960, state committees for children and youth sponsored youth councils in a number of states. The Oregon Youth Council conducted, in 1958, a highly successful state-wide survey of counseling in high schools with recommendations that were widely disseminated through

PTA's, service clubs, and other community groups. This same Youth Council in 1962 published a youth employment handbook distributed to private and public social agencies dealing with youth and to all the high schools in the state. Youth Councils in several states including Oregon, Michigan, and Minnesota, conducted state-wide conferences on problems of concern to youth. Like most conferences, it is difficult to assess the impact of these conferences on social change. Certainly, many of the recommendations flowing from these conferences of 8 to 10 years ago still are not implemented, for example, in areas of youth employment, programs to prevent school dropouts, racial prejudice, and the eradication of poverty.

A careful review of the literature available on youth councils at state and local levels reveals a general inability to meaningfully involve youth. Generally, adults wanted youth to imitate adults. The model UN assemblies that were so popular during the late 40's and early 50's are an example of how adults asked youth to play adult games. Youth council programs were another game youth were asked to play.

> **The traditional involvement of youth in such activities as youth councils has been characterized by adult manipulation, paternalism, and authoritative control.**[17]

Dumont states that adults tend to have misconceptions about youth:

> **Most of us assume that if we treat them like grown-ups and give them a model of grownup institutions to play with, like student government, they will, like good children or the kind of socialized animals that we have tried to generate, act in accordance with the behavior patterns that we have established for them. For example, if we let them play house, their playing house will be a kind of mirror image of carbon copy or doll house variety of our family institutions.**
>
> **And if we let them play school, as young children do, again there will be a teacher in the front and the children playing children will sit in front of the teacher and ape what the teacher is saying. And every institution we allow them to play with, including government, they will do like sort of shrunken grown-ups.**
> **We are just beginning to discover that it may not work that way; that young people's perception of grown-up institutions may be very profoundly different from our own perception of those same institutions.**[18]

[17] Spergel, Irving A. *Community problem solving: the delinquency example,* Chicago, University of Chicago, 1969. p. 52.
[18] Dumont, Matthew P. *Young people: a community asset.* New York, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, 1969. (mimeo.)

THE "TREATMENT" MODEL

During the late 40's, when the importance of youth involvement in program planning and management was developed and widely heralded, the same concept of involving troubled youth in the solutions of their own problems was an integral part. The use of the ill as therapist to others with similar ills is at least as old as Alcoholics Anonymous in 1935. The idea may be even older, but with problem youth it did not take hold until 1949, with the establishment of Highfields in New Jersey. Highfields was a 20-bed facility with an intensive group experience for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. Considerable decision-making power was invested in the group and the group culture was built around the norm of each delinquent helping the other with his "problems." This was done through an insistence on honesty, confrontation, accepting the group's perception of self and self-commitment to change, and through the group's assessment of the ability of a member to genuinely care about others' problems and to help the new members of the group. This program, which became known as "guided group interaction," [19] has been expanded in New Jersey and has now spread to delinquency treatment programs in Kentucky, Minnesota, California, Utah, New York, Florida, and other states. Similar group techniques have been adopted in the treatment of narcotic addiction (e.g., Synanon) and even to "spiritual malaise" (e.g., Esalen).

During the 50's when youth involvement became a concept less talked about in conferences and relegated mostly to state and local youth councils, the use of the techniques with delinquents was the major new development in delinquency treatment. The new group treatment techniques had little impact upon existing juvenile correctional institutions but were well represented in new programs that were established.[20] The "treatment" model of youth involvement is the most successful implementation of the idea.

[19] McCorkle, Lloyd; Elias, A.; and Bixby, F. Lovel. *The Highfields story.* New York, Holt Rinehart, 1958.

[20] Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. *Alternatives to incarceration,* by LaMar T. Empey. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

THE "ACTION" MODEL

As already indicated in New York City, which embarked on the initial push for youth involvement in a conference in 1945, little was subsequently heard about youth involvement until the late 50's. Gang warfare was the major concern of private and public social agencies. Out of gang war preventive efforts emerged the ambitious and comprehensive juvenile delinquency prevention program known as Mobilization for Youth. This was a total community organization approach, with a heavy emphasis on youth involvement, which served as a prototype of a large number of community development projects.[21] National Institute of Mental Health and Ford Foundation monies were supplemented with large Federal grants in the early 60's. The President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, through the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, by 1963 had funded 14 major community development projects which emphasized youth involvement in program planning and development.[22]

It is usually assumed that youth want to participate. While this assumption would appear to be generally well founded, it may not in all cases be true. Sometimes apathy, lack of interest, and inertia are major obstacles and in these cases youth need to be motivated to become involved.[23] Some program failures are directly related to disinterest by youths.

> **Mobilization for Youth began to put more and more effort into working with slum residents to achieve the changes in education, employment, and living conditions requisite to increasing opportunities and improving services in the community. It was proposed that in order to integrate youth into socially constructive community life, their adult role models must be organized as participating members of the community. To convince youth that antisocial behavior is not the only viable means of participation in the community they must be shown that adult residents have some**

[21] Mobilization for Youth. *A proposal for the prevention and control of delinquency by expanding opportunities.* New York, 1961.

[22] For a description of six of these programs, see: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. *Helping youth: a study of six community organization programs,* by Charles F. Grosser. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

[23] *Op. cit. supra* note 17, p. 162 and *op. cit. supra* note 21. Also see Harlem Youth Opportunities, Inc. *Youth in the ghetto: a study of the consequences of powerlessness and a blueprint for change.* New York, 1964.

control over their environment. As part of its community approach to delinquency prevention and control, MFY hoped to overcome the apathy and defeatism of the slum dweller through its community self-help program.[24]

This detour of organizing the poor and dispossessed to reach a point where "meaningful" youth involvement could be possible was considerably longer than at first envisioned. In 1964, the Federal government declared "war on poverty" and the war was to be conducted with "maximum feasible participation" by the poor. Certain community powers began to get the message. Involvement meant change, reform, and threat to existing power alliances. Local political groups and mayors' offices fought back. Conflict has been the theme ever since. Youth, students, blacks, police, national guard, the army, congress, state houses, county courthouses, have all been "involved"—mostly in conflict. Dialogue has not played a notable part; no one seems to be listening to the other.

The "action" model of youth involvement quickly moved away from established organizational bases. The autonomous organization became the preferred base of action and this occurred primarily because of youth's fear of co-optation. The "action" model was clearly aimed at social reform, social change, and if this didn't happen, revolution.

[24] Harlow, Eleanor. "Prevention of crime and delinquency: a review of the literature." Information Review on Crime and Delinquency, 1(6):17, 1969. See also Weissman, Harold H. ed. *Community development*. New York, Association Press, 1969.

THE "JOB TRAINING" MODEL

Another attempt at youth involvement has been in the employment sector. Examples are summer job programs, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Management Development and Training Assistance for New Careers. These programs have had mixed success and have proved least capable of using youth involvement techniques. Most have been hampered by lack of resources, lack of understanding of the youths themselves, and insufficient involvement of youth in program planning and development. The "new careers" approach appears to hold the most promise. This is an effort to create subprofessional jobs in human services. Just as the medical profession has relieved physicians of routine, uncomplicated tasks by employing technicians and nurse's aides, so other fields such as education, correction, mental health, and social welfare can learn to delegate nonprofessional functions to subprofessional personnel. New careers programs restructure job descriptions and provide tasks to be performed by subprofessionals.[25]

Early evaluations of some of these programs have revealed that in some cases new careerists perform certain tasks *better* than do the professionals. Professionals have not accepted new careers programs with open arms but have done so at least grudgingly. A ladder concept for new careerists to advance through training, education, and job experience to professional status is encountering considerable resistance from civil service systems and some professional organizations.

[25] For information about new careers programs and concepts contact the National Institute of New Careers, University Research Corporation, 4301 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

LOOKING BACK

With all these varied experience with youth involvement, what has been learned? Experiences with youth involvement techniques do not present a clear picture.

There have been political ramifications in some programs which have resulted in the demise of youth involvement activities.[26]

Youth involvement projects with limited and short-term goals are reported to have succeeded, for instance, in riot control,[27] and in convening state-wide conferences.

There has been a persistent unwillingness to permit delinquents to determine their own social needs and programs in the community as well as in traditional correctional institutions despite the fact that it is in this area that youth involvement techniques have proved most successful. Spergel suggests that delinquency may serve certain organizational purposes which explains this reluctance.[28] Even in the comprehensive community demonstration and development programs aimed at delinquency prevention in the early 1960's there was considerable resistance to change on the part of local authorities. In some cases there were even attempts to sabotage programs evidencing preliminary success with youth involvement.[29]

Looking back over the early 60's, 50's, 40's, one is forced to conclude that with the exception of the development of techniques for involving delinquents in helping other delinquents, very little has been learned about involving youth in decision-making regarding policies and programs directly or indirectly affecting youth.

---

[26] For an excellent description of one failure, see *Nassau County Youth for Youth Program: a challenge to youth.* East Meadow, N.Y., Nassau County Division of Recreation and Parks, 1967; and the July 1967, November 1967, and July 1968 newsletters from the Nassau County Youth for Youth Organization, *Youth for Youth Reporter.*

[27] *Op. cit. supra* note 17, p. 189 and the "White Act" concept as outlined in *Proposal: City of Tampa Youth Patrol "Tampa Technique,"* prepared by Commission of Community Relations and Tampa, Fla., Police Department. (mimeo).

[28] See: Spergel, Irving, "Politics, policies and the delinquent problem." Washington, D.C., Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1966. (mimeo).

[29] See: Marias, Peter and Rein, Martin. *Dilemmas of social reform: poverty and community action in the United States.* New York, Atherton Press, 1967; and *op. cit. supra* note 22.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recently there has been a revival of interest in youth involvement on the part of "establishment" organizations. National, state, and local, public and private organizations more and more have confronted the issue of how they can effectively involve youth. Undoubtedly, this revival of interest is a response to the dramatic illustration of youth alienation as illustrated by the "Hippie" phenomenon, increased drug use by youth, demonstrations and confrontations of youth with police, and the expressions by some youth of their concern with this nation's priorities and national purpose.

In the past few months there have been major concessions by organizations to open doors to youth in decision-making. National professional organizations have undergone major confrontations leading to both structural changes and changes in program priorities. Youth have been admitted to decision-making on faculty committees and boards in universities. National social welfare organizations have added youth to their national boards. Whether this becomes an effective way of involving youth remains to be assessed.

At its annual meeting in New York City May 1-2, 1969, the National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, Inc., added 6 young people under 20 years of age and 3 young adults between 20 and 26 to the 300 older persons who compose its trustee membership. By this action, the Assembly fulfilled one of the 130 recommendations of a youth-adult Dialogue of Ages, which occupied a full day of the annual meeting.

The "dialogue" brought together 99 young people representing a broad spectrum of backgrounds from all sections of the United States, and 152 adults who were members of the National Assembly, either as individuals or as representatives of organizations. Groups of 10, composed of both young people and adults, probed the following issues: the sharing of power, the emergence of autonomous youth organizations, collaboration of young people and adults on problems of social control, establishment of trust between generations, young people as volunteers, the world of work, educational experience for intergenerational collaboration, and emergence of new sex roles and family patterns.

Differences in values, described as a "people gap," rather than the difference in chronological age, or "generation gap," were frequently cited to explain misunderstandings between young people and adults. One of

the value differences noted was in the sense of urgency about resolving the social lags represented by poverty and racial discrimination. As one teenage participant put it, "We want to do something about the problems *now*."

In May 1969, the Children's Bureau issued a small publication entitled *Principles for youth-adult participation.*[30] The guide is directed toward adults and makes 10 suggestions to aid in securing meaningful and significant youth participation in resolving social problems affecting youth. The tenor and language, however, contrast with the more militant and revolutionary language emerging from autonomous youth organizations seeking "a piece of the action."

The President's Council on Youth Opportunity was established in 1967, with the Vice President as chairman. Members include the heads of 10 Federal departments and agencies. A small Council staff works year-round maintaining Federal youth program liaison and providing technical assistance to cities and states. It also seeks the active cooperation of the private sector and provides a clearinghouse service for youth program information. The Council is responsible for: (1) encouraging state and local governments and the private sector to participate in efforts to enhance opportunity for youth; and (2) asuring effective program planning, coordination, and evaluation for summer and other youth programs of the Federal Government.[31]

The Urban Research Corporation has published guidelines for youth involvement in community service projects.[32] This interest by private industry in youth involvement appears to be quite recent.

In Connecticut there was a state-wide conference with the theme Youth Involvement in the Community—Rights and Responsibilities. It is reported that many of the participants felt that greater opportunity for youth participation would lessen the need for youth demonstrations. There was a recommendation for youth to be invited to sit on school boards and town councils. No publication has resulted from this conference as yet, but it is reported that in Danbury, Conn., youth sit as non-voting members on 17 city boards and commissions including the Common Council and School Board. They serve a term of one year and other than the fact that they do not vote, they are treated in all respects like regular board members.[33]

Similar activities are taking place in other states. In Pennsylvania, the Governor has urged the establishment of local youth advisory councils

---

[30] Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Restatement of the principles for youth-adult participation developed by the National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth.* Washington, D.C., 1969.

[31] Manual for Youth Coordinators (1969 ed.). NOW news from the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, 801-19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. published periodically during the year.

[32] Science Research Associates, Inc. *Youth takes the lead.* Chicago, Urban Research Corporation, 1969.

[33] The Connecticut Commission of Youth Services, 643 Maple Avenue, Hartford. Connecticut issues a monthly newsletter and serves as a state clearinghouse for youth involvement procedures and programs.

to give youth a voice in policy development.[54] In other states emphasis has been placed on creating opportunities for youth to do volunteer work in community agencies.[55]

The tone of current literature suggests that youth involvement may be a temporary fad; if this is true then in the near future very much less will be heard about it. It is also quite possible that the best programs have not yet been reported. Thus, the published literature may not reflect accurately the actual state of youth participation. Certainly, the recent plea of youth to be allowed resources to work for change outside the "system" has not yet been written about.

The shift from treating youth as mere recipients of services to engaging them as active participants in the provision of those services, has occurred in a wide variety of contexts. It has included guided group interaction programs for delinquents in which youths come to share with the staff major decision-making responsibility; "new careers" programs in which youth are trained to undertake tasks previously performed by professionals and for which in some cases youth are better qualified because of their youthfulness or disadvantaged backgrounds; programs encompassing recreation, employment, job training, and other activities which youths organize and operate themselves under adult guidance; and peace-keeping projects in which youth perform riot control functions with the approval of law enforcement officials. In all such programs youth are placed in positions of responsibility and authority comparable to, and in some cases identical to, those of adults. For the young people involved in such programs there is a sense of having "a piece of the action," and of pride, which traditional youth programs seldom generate.

Youth involvement programs have experienced difficulty. Some members of guided group interaction programs refuse to become involved and retain their commitment to delinquency. Adults fear giving too much power to young people, particularly ghetto youth, and find ways to subvert youth involvement programs. Professionals are chagrined to find that youngsters with half their education and none of the experience can do some jobs better than they can. Police departments are outraged that they must assume responsibility for keeping order with autonomous youth organizations unhappy with the pace of change. There have been as many problems with involving youth in the planning and operation of delinquency prevention and rehabilitation projects as there were in the poverty programs which required "maximum feasible participation" of the poor.

---

[54] Pennsylvania. Governor's Office of Administration. "Let's listen to youth: a suggested program for local youth advisory councils." Harrisburg, Pa., 1969.

[55] National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. *100,000 hours a week*. Report of a conference held in Chicago, December 1964. New York, 1965. In this report see especially: Kiraly, Philippa. "Teenage volunteers in Mt. Pleasant (Cleveland) Community Centers Tutoring Project," pp. 20-22; and Kobrin, Solomon. "Values and problems in the use of the indigenous volunteer in delinquency prevention programs," pp. 51-54. Also see: National Commission on Resources for Youth. *Youth tutoring youth*. New York, 1969.

There is much that is not known, but there also is an awareness that youth *needs* to be involved. The subculture of youth is not going to pass away, and it will not allow itself to be ignored. Ways must be found to *meaningfully* involve youth in our society.

> **Any activity, any program should be in the nature of a challenge to youth, requiring concerted planning and action. Involvement in the planning and execution affords, at the same time, the occasion for the individual to test his acceptance or rejection by others, an occasion for him to prove himself to others, and an occasion personally to excel in the process.**
>
> **When policy is formulated, action programs outlined, and facilities provided in harmony with this principle, a self-image will emerge in the youth that he feels as his own free creation and, hence, something to be cherished and lived up to in its practical implications. The alternative in which programs are worked out only by adults for the benefit of youth with the intent of doing something to them is bound to share the fate of all such ill-conceived policies. When we are made to take part in programs which are not of our own free initiation or free choosing, we simply go through the moves. The benefits are only transitory at best. We may drag our feet or evade them when we can with immunity, as has been the case with regimented programs and activities in which the individual himself is not ego-involved as a personally committed and aspiring active participant in concert with others important in his eyes.**[16]

[16] Sherif, Muzafer and Sherif, Carolyn, *Reference groups*. New York, Harper and Row, 1964, p. 313.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM EXAMPLES

THE TREATMENT MODEL

6083* Pilnick, Saul; Allen, Robert F.; and Clapp, Neale W. "Adolescent integrity from Highfields to Essexfields and Collegefields." Paper presented to the National Conference on Social Welfare. Chicago, 1966. 17 p.

The Collegefields Group Educational Center at Newark State College in New Jersey was created in 1965 as an outgrowth of the Essexfields concept of the rehabilitation of delinquents by means of a nondelinquent peer group. Collegefields is a non-residential treatment center for 14 and 15 year old delinquent boys. It provides a daily experience in guided group interaction in an intensive educational program designed to assist potential school dropouts in developing sufficient skills and motivations to remain in school. A special educational curriculum and a social work program for the boys' families are part of the program. The objectives of the Collegefields program are to reorient and motivate the boys to positive and constructive behavior, to provide assistance in gaining necessary educational skills, and to integrate community services to accomplish these goals. During the 16 years since the original program was established at Highfields, there has been remarkable success, demonstrating that it is possible to create new subcultural group norms which counteract already established norms of the delinquent subculture.

4921 Pilnick, Saul; Elias, Albert; and Clapp, Neale W. "The Essexfields concept: a new approach to the social treatment of juvenile delinquents." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 2(1):109-124, 1966.

The Essexfields program in Newark, N.J., has attempted to design a "social system" which utilizes peer group influences in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. New "pro-social" norms are established and reinforced within the group, replacing or altering "street" norms. The program includes work during the day, meals, recreation, and evening group interaction sessions. The boys live at home overnight and on weekends. Peer group interaction while working,

* The number preceding each citation is the retrieval number in the Information Center Storage System of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

eating, and talking together as well as during guided sessions exerts pressures on individual boys to conform to the established Essexfields culture. Norms, traditions, language, and conceptions of deviancy built up within and indigenous to the system are transmitted from "old" to "new" boys. The informal norm structure has been built up by the boys themselves and often becomes part of the formal program through their own initiative. The program recognizes the need for meaningful transition to community life and uses the graduate peer group for this purpose. Use of the peer group as a treatment agent for adolescents has implications beyond the field of correction, in the classroom, and in helping culturally disadvtanged youths.

4735 Southfields Residential Group Center. "The residential group center as a treatment method for selected youthful offenders age 16 and 17," by John M. Wall, Albert Elias, and Albert Axelrod. Anchorage, Kentucky, 1966. 12 p.; and "Southfields four-year statistical summary." Anchorage, Kentucky, 1966. 47 p., tables.

The Southfields Residential Group Center, founded in 1961 upon the principles developed in the Highfields project in New Jersey, is a group treatment center which houses 20 male delinquent youths between 16 and 18 years of age who have not been previously committed to a state training school and who are neither physically, intellectually, nor psychologically handicapped. Treatment at the Center is based upon the assumption that most delinquents become involved in antisocial offenses through adaptation to their environments. In treatment, the peer group is used as a medium of change and as a means of influencing its members. Guided group interaction sessions are conducted five evenings a week for one and a half hours. These sessions, although strongly dependent on the other features of the program, are the major method of treatment. In group sessions the boys are led to reorient their values, attitudes, and behavior and to become independent of delinquent peer group pressures. They progress through four stages in which the leader takes different roles and which are intended to promote self-awareness on the part of the boys. The four-year statistical summary which is included gives data on the successes and failures of Southfields' program. It indicates that the Southfields graduate has a much better success rate and a much lower rate of recidivism than either Kentucky Village releases or non-graduates from Southfields.

THE YOUTH COUNCIL MODEL

P 1760 Ranton, Loren W. *Project Summary*: Youth involvement in delinquency prevention, control and treatment: proposal of a project.

The purpose of this project is to develop a plan providing an opportunity for the youth in Washington to become involved in the decision-making process related to delinquency prevention. Youth are involved in social problem-solving in an attempt to discover whether or not they have an impact upon their peers. An official sub-group of the Washington Council, the Committee on Delinquency and Youth, consisting of high school age youth, has all the operating responsibilities. Objectives of the project include: developing new and improved delinquency prevention; and facilitating improved communication and cooperation among youth of all races, colors, creeds, and backgrounds, and between youth and adults. The Committee is made up of representatives from local, state, and national public and private youth-serving organizations, the delinquent population, and from the general population of teenage youth. The project provides educational experiences for its participants; the youth are exposed to information enhancing their knowledge of laws, law enforcement, courts, and corrections. Field trips, personal contacts with officials, written material, films, and visiting speakers are used in the learning process. Research techniques being used include: (1) a questionnaire administered to all the Committee members; (2) evaluation of individual projects; (3) study of case examples of individual Committee members; and (4) evaluation of the impact of the Committee by the Washington Council.

2466 Providence Youth Progress Board. *Youth progress report, 1965.* Providence, R.I., 1965.

Progress for Providence is the community action agency for Providence, Rhode Island. Some of its tentative programs are briefly described, e.g., pre-school programs preparing children to enter kindergarten. Other programs suggested are the establishment of group homes, a program for recreation for retarded children, having neighborhood workers assist personnel currently working in community centers, using detached workers to establish relationships with alienated youth, and development of protective services. During the summer of 1964 the Providence Youth Progress Board concluded a special youth project, Teenagers Probe, during which 60 youths were employed to interview their peers in selected neighborhoods. The probe provided the staff with firsthand information on the perceptions of Providence youth relative to their community and their own problems. The most frequently expressed opinions were incorporated into subsequent planning. Neighborhood Resource Units are now in operation in six neighborhoods. They are designed to facilitate the more effective delivery of services to an individual child, youth, adult or family living in a given geographic area. The major area of focus is juvenile delinquency, both preven-

tion and control. Counseling is offered to youths who are in trouble and to their families. To bridge the gap between alienated youth and the socializing institutions a Community Youth Service Program, consisting of Drop-In Centers, and Garage Centers, was developed. The programs were designed to reach and permit unaffiliated youths to associate with one another in surroundings they consider their own. They are unstructured and non-regimented. *The participants are encouraged to take an active part in planning and carrying out programs.*

(Providence Youth Progress Board, Inc., 333 Grotto Avenue, Providence, Rhode Island).

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Grant No. 66021 *East Central Citizens Organization,* Columbus, Ohio. Director: Thomas Green

The project was a demonstration of a method of youth involvement predicated upon the assumption that norms, attitudes, values and individual self-perception are shaped and solidified by peer group association. The project provided separate facilities which youth managed. A newly formed youth organization sponsored a variety of youth serving programs including job training, remedial services, cultural arts and recreation. A youth committee composed of adults and youth representing all social, educational, and economic levels of the community acted in an advisory capacity to the project, and reflected the ideas and needs of youth. While adults were represented on the youth committee, the main emphasis was placed on youth management with accountability provided through the parent organization to the residents of the neighborhood.

8904 California. Youth Authority Department. *Youth participation in community action: Report of a demonstration training project,* by Rosalind Cassidy. Sacramento, Calif.

The Youth Participation in Community Action Project was a one-year action/demonstration program to train and employ California minority youth from impoverished areas. The training was directed toward: (1) helping youth to identify their own community problems; (2) planning for action in relation to those problems most important to them; and (3) aiding them to carry out their plans for solving the problems. Upon completion of their training, the youths were organized into survey teams to work in cooperation with city and community agencies in various California cities seeking solutions to community problems. The trainee teams worked in an advisory capacity, dealing with matters relating to recreational services and facilities, youth employment, and interracial relations, among others. This association of trainees with community agencies educated the trainees in the mechanics and the uses of government in a democratic society. Also, it indicated to local government

agencies the needs of minority youth. In addition to providing useful work experiences in social service activities, the program redirected rebellious, hostile, and destructive youth toward seeking responsible and lawful ways to achieve change without violence.

THE JOB TRAINING MODEL

T-5324 Howard University. Center for Youth and Community Studies. *Leadership in the training of human service aides,* by William Klein and Jacob R. Fishman. Washington, D.C., 1966, 62 p.

To train disadvantaged young adults as group leaders (counseling interns) for the counseling and training of disadvantaged youth enrolled in the Human Services Aide (New Careers) Training Program, a program was established at the Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University. The nine-month program was divided into three-month segments. This report covers the first segment which has as its goal the counseling intern's development in competence in group and individual intervention, awareness of the principle of agency structure, and the ability to analyze and solve problems.

Tests developed by the training staff indicated no significant change that could not be accounted for by chance. However, as rated by their supervisors, 11 out of 14 interns showed improvement in job performance. Assignment to high- or low-risk category did not accurately predict successful on-the-job performance.

CONTENTS: Introduction; Staff development for the program; Selection process; Phase I of training; Assessment of trainee performance; Appendices.

T-5087 President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. *Training for new careers: the community apprentice program.* Washington, D.C., 1965, 107 p.

This edited report describes a Howard University program designed to cope with the problem of the lack of opportunity for youth by devising new types of non-professional careers. Details of the program and its results are included and suggestions for further exploration into this field are proposed.

(Available for 60¢ by writing to: Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402)

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Grant No. 67209 San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Calif. Director: Dr. Mario d'Angeli

During the first year, this program trained 20 hard core delinquent youngsters, who had indicated leadership potential, for jobs as

street workers. The boys participated in a series of exploratory sessions with representatives of various agencies. During the second year, the project emphasized: (1) monitoring of the work experience of youth in agencies; (2) exploration of how an agency has to adapt to these new youth aides; (3) evaluation of job performance and "career" possibilities; and (4) development of further placement opportunities and increased relations with the State Welfare Department, which paid the trainees' stipends.

ACTION MODEL

T 5519 California Center for Community Development. "Training for action," by John Davis and Lloyd Colby Grant. Del Ray, Calif. 1967, 38 p.

This program was designed to orient Mexican and Negro youth to social action and change within large city communities. Thirty-three recruits responded who were job and action oriented and had enough interest to merit an interview. The great discrepancy between Negro and Mexican applicants partially reflects the four-to-one ratio of Negroes to Mexicans on the staff, the differences in background and interests which appeal more to Negroes, and the differential access to and response by community agencies. Of the dozen agencies contacted for recruitment, only three responded. Twelve Negro and five barrio youths were eligible for the first training session, but only nine trainees appeared on the first day, six Negro and three Mexican. Three additional Mexican trainees were recruited. The climate of the program was generated by a militant Negro staff, dissenters, a laissez-faire attitude toward expression of point of view, and a heavily Negro trainee group which was also militant and nationalistic. The climate, at least in part, caused the negative reaction of the Mexican trainees who were far less militant and nationalistic. In addition, it seriously immobiziled the staff.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Grant No. 67202 California Center for Community Development. Del Ray, Calif. Director: Timothy J. Sampson

This program was developed by the California Center for Community Development in cooperation with the Southern California Council of Churches. It was an effort by two major community organizations to develop leadership and socially accepted alternatives for the youths of the community. The project trained youths to meet the personnel needs of social action projects in Watts and other low-income areas of Los Angeles. The program developed and tested means of teaching social action strategies and techniques to ghetto and barrio youth.

Sixty-four youths were included in the two types of training programs. A Social Action Intern Program recruited and trained Negro and Mexican-American youths in a ten-month social action leadership program. This was a full-time program for which the youths receive $200 per month stipend paid by the Southern California Council of Churches. The main teaching techniques were discussion, demonstration, and an 8½ month field placement experience. After six weeks of orientation and training, these interns were placed in ongoing social action programs.

The Social Action Orientation training was an intensive, three-week workshop on social action. The workshop content included consideration of the interrelationships between youths, the community problem solution, means of organizing for social action, and the responsibility of neighborhood organizers. There was a continuing relationship between training staff and the orientation trainees.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Grant No. 66011 Lower Eastside Action Project, Inc. (LEAP), 44 East 3rd St., New York, N.Y. 10003. Director: Laurence S. Cole

The goal of the Project was to close the gap between the underachieving youth of the urban ghetto and their potentialities by providing relevant alternatives to resignation and failure.

Project emphases were on natural group development and self-determination, one-to-one relationships with staff, easy access to adult support, programming as determined by member interest, and the development of a social commitment. The Project addressed the problems of individuation, education, and social action. A major goal was the participation of youth in the solution of their community's problems, allowing for their development as an effective and constructive force for change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Berger, Bennett M. "The new style of American man: almost endless adolescence." *New York Times Magazine*, November 2, 1969.

Bernstein, Saul. *Alternative to violence: alienated youth, and riots, race, poverty.* New York, Association Press, 1967.

Bettelheim, Bruno. "Obsolete youth: towards a psychograph of adolescent rebellion," *Encounter*, (September) 1969.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Governor's Council for Human Services Committee on Children and Youth. *For the house of tomorrow.* Harrisburg, Pa., 1969.

Conference on Youth Needs. Report of the proceedings sponsored by the Civilan Defense Volunteer Office and Welfare Council of New York City, January 13, 1945. New York, 1945.

Dumont, Matthew P. *Young people: a community asset.* New York, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development, 1969.

Gerzon, Mark. *The whole world is watching.* New York, Viking Press, 1969.

Halleck, Seymour L. "Why they'd rather do their own thing." *Think*, (Sept-Oct) 1968.

Harlem Youth Opportunities, Inc. *Youth in the ghetto: a study of the consequences of powerlessness and a blueprint for change.* New York, 1964. 620 p.

Harlow, Eleanor. "Prevention of crime and delinquency: a review of the literature." *Information Review on Crime and Delinquency*, 1(6):17, 1969.

Human Development Planning Project of St. Louis. *Gateways for youth: a proposal.* St. Louis, Human Development Corporation, 1964. 215 p. Especially chapter IV: "Gateway: youth groups." pp. 116-147.

— Keniston, Kenneth. *The young radicals.* New York, Harcourt, 1965.

Laquer, Walter. "Reflections on youth movements." *Commentary*, (June): 1969.

McCorkle, Lloyd; Elias, Albert; and Bixby, F. Lovel. *The Highfields Story.* New York, Holt Rinehart, 1958.

Manual for Planning and Organizing a Summer Youth Opportunity Program. Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, no date. (Available from the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, 801 19th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.)

Manual for Youth Coordinators. Washington, D.C., President's Council on Youth Opportunity, 1969. 171 p. (Chapters on planning, employment, education, recreation, and transportation.)

Marias, Peter and Rein, Martin. *Dilemmas of social reform: poverty and community action in the United States.* New York, Atherton Press, 1967.

Minnesota. Youth Conservation Commission. Community Organization for Youth. *A manual for community planning.* St. Paul, Minn., 1949.

Mobilization for Youth. *A proposal for the prevention and control of delinquency by expanding opportunities.* New York, 1961.

Nassau County Youth for Youth Program. *A challenge to youth.* (Handbook). East Meadow, N.Y., Nassau County Division of Recreation and Parks, 1967. 27 p.

National Commission on Resources for Youth. *Youth tutoring youth.* New York, 1969.

National Committee for Children and Youth. *Patterns of organization of state committees for children and youth.* Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

National Committee for Children and Youth. *Youth and the establishment.* Report of the National Conference on Youth and the Institutions, August 1968. Washington, D.C., 1969. 112 p.

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. *100,000 hours a week.* Report of a conference held in Chicago, December 1964. New York, 1965.

Pennsylvania. Governor's Office of Administration. *Let's listen to youth: a suggested program for local youth advisory councils.* Harrisburg, Pa. 1969. 25 p.

President's Council on Youth Opportunity. *Bibliography on youth programs.* Washington, D.C., 1969. (Available from: 801 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006).

Recommendations for action. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice by the panels of the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Schul, Bill D., ed. *Community planning for youth.* Topeka, Kans., Office of the Kansas Attorney General, 1964.

Science Research Associates, Inc. *Youth takes the lead.* Chicago, American Research Corporation, 1969.

Sherif, Muzafer and Sherif, Carolyn. *Reference groups.* New York, Harper and Row, 1964.

Shmelzer, June. "Youth involvement: a position paper." Washington, D.C., Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1968.

Spergel, Irving A. *Community problem solving: the delinquency.* Chicago, University of Chicago, 1969.

Spergel, Irving. "Politics, policies, and the delinquent problem." Washington, D.C., Office of Juvenile delinquency and Youth Development, 1966.

Taylor, Harold. *Students without teachers.* New York, McGraw Hill.

Traylor, Lorenzo H. "Offender roles and the Youth Opportunities Board program." In: *Experiment in Culture Expansion.* Proceedings of a conference on the use of products of a social problem in coping with the problem, held at the California Rehabilitation Center, Norco, Calif., July 10-12, 1963. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Mental Health, 1963. p. 57-59.

Thigpen, Robert B. and Downing, Lyle A. "Power, participation and the politics of civilization." *Christian Century,* July 23, 1969.

Children's Bureau, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Restatement of the principles for youth-adult participation developed by the National Council of State Committees for Children and Youth.* Washington, D.C., 1969.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, *Alternatives to incarceration,* by LaMar T. Empey. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, *Helping youth: a study of six community organization programs,* by Charles F. Grosser. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Weissman, Harold H. ed. *Community development.* New York, Association Press, 1969.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1970 O - 387-745